

next war and do the next battle based on their experiences with the previous war, Senator Wesely is doing the same thing. He's doing battle on LB 829 and LB 830 based on the war that took place eight years ago on LB 775. This bill is not LB 775. This is not a bill that individual companies merely qualify and get entitlements for, they have to make application for it, and part of the application process is going to be a justification that the job levels, the pay level of the jobs will be beneficial to Nebraska's economy, that they will, in fact, fit within the economic development plan of the state. I think the issues he's fighting really are the last war, they are not...they are not this one. Concept...as I read the amendment, what it says is that all of these 500 jobs would have to be \$11 an hour or more jobs. In other words, if a custodian is hired at less than \$11 an hour, that that individual would not...that job would not qualify. I think it probably is a standard that we should not be writing into statute, particularly the term...there are a number of reasons why what Senator Wesely is wanting to do is not a good idea, and this is not a good amendment. I would just simply urge the body to reject this amendment. I think the general thrust of his comment that we do want to attract businesses to our state that are higher paying jobs, that our population will, in fact, benefit from having those jobs in our area is a good point. I don't think this amendment does that, and I think the provisions of not automatic qualification that did exist in LB 775, but that there will have to be a lot of scrutiny of the projects by the board, the board being the Governor, the Secretary of State and the director of the Investment Council, already deals adequately with the problem that he's addressing and adding an 11 dollar figure further complicates, it's not good policy and I would urge the body to reject the amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Thank you, Madam President. I also rise in opposition to the amendment for very much the same reasons that the Speaker just outlined. So I won't revisit those. I also just want to take the opportunity...I understand Senator Wesely's continual concern with 775, but I have to, once again, rise and indicate while there might be some abuses around the state relative to 775 and some of the projects maybe not being worthy, I want to emphasize once again that relative to District 30, LB 775 was a benefit to our area, it created well over 500 jobs in our industrial park, well-paying manufacturing